

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

APOLINAR CRUZ-CRUZ.,

Defendant.

Case No. CR13-49RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
SUPPRESS WIRETAP  
INTERCEPTIONS

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This matter comes before the Court on “Defendant Cruz’s Motion to Suppress Wiretap Interceptions.” Dkt. # 198. Having reviewed the memoranda, declarations, and exhibits submitted by the parties, and having considered the evidence and arguments presented during the September 23, 2014 hearing on this motion, the Court finds as follows:

**II. BACKGROUND**

The Drug Enforcement Agency obtained substantial evidence against defendant in two separate investigations prior to November 2012. Dkt. # 198 (Def.’s Mot.) at 3, 5-7; Dkt. ## 200-1, 200-4, 201-1, 201-2. On November 9, 2012, after identifying defendant as a co-conspirator in the Salazar drug trafficking organization (“Salazar DTO”), the government applied for a wiretap for defendant’s phone (“TT8”). Dkt. ## 218-4, 218-5, 218-6, 218-7, 218-8. In the government’s wiretap application and the accompanying affidavit, the government did not include its evidence

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
SUPPRESS WIRETAP INTERCEPTIONS - 1

1 against defendant from the prior investigations, even though this evidence arguably would have  
2 sufficed for an indictment. Dkt. # 198 at 7-11. The wiretap was authorized by the Honorable  
3 Richard A. Jones and produced incriminating evidence against defendant.

4 Defendant moves to suppress all evidence discovered as a result of this wiretap, on the  
5 grounds that the older evidence against him rendered the wiretap unnecessary and that omitting  
6 this evidence violated the federal wiretapping statute. Dkt. # 198 at 12-15; Oral Argument.  
7 Defendant alternatively requests a hearing under Franks v. Delaware, 438 U.S. 154 (1978)  
8 (“Franks hearing”), on the grounds that the government’s failure to include the older evidence in  
9 its November 9, 2012 wiretap application constituted a reckless or intentional material omission.  
10 Dkt. # 198 at 15-18. For the following reasons, these arguments fail.

### 11 III. DISCUSSION

#### 12 A. The Government’s Wiretap Application Provided a Full and Complete 13 Statement Establishing the Necessity of the Wiretap.

14 Pursuant to the Omnibus Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1968 (18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-  
15 2522), an application for a court-authorized wiretap must include “a full and complete statement  
16 as to whether or not other investigative procedures have been tried and failed or why they  
17 reasonably appear to be unlikely to succeed if tried or to be too dangerous.” 18 U.S.C. §  
18 2518(1)(c). The judge reviewing the application must determine whether the government has  
19 properly shown that “normal investigative procedures” have failed or should not be attempted.  
20 See id. § 2518(3)(c). In essence, the government must overcome a statutory presumption against  
21 granting a wiretap application by showing that the wiretap is necessary to further an  
22 investigation, United States v. Gonzalez, Inc., 412 F.3d 1102, 1112 (9th Cir. 2005); if law  
23 enforcement has not attempted to use traditional methods in a case before resorting to a wiretap,  
24 then the court must reject the government’s application, United States v. Carneiro, 861 F.2d  
25 1171, 1176 (9th Cir. 1988). This “necessity” requirement exists in order to limit the use of  
26 wiretaps, as they are highly intrusive. United States v. Commito, 918 F.2d 95, 98 (9th Cir.

1 1990). When reviewing whether a wiretap authorization order was properly issued, a court  
2 reviews *de novo* whether the application represented a “full and complete statement,” and  
3 reviews the issuing judge’s finding of necessity for abuse of discretion. United States v.  
4 Shryock, 342 F.3d 948, 975 (9th Cir. 2003); United States v. Yim, 2012 WL 395791, at \*5  
5 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 7, 2012), aff’d sub nom., United States v. Drew Yim, 534 F. App’x 623 (9th  
6 Cir. 2013).

7 Defendant argues that the government’s wiretap application did not make a “full and  
8 complete statement” with regards to TT8 because the government omitted evidence proving that  
9 it was unnecessary to wiretap this phone in order to build a case against him; on the same basis,  
10 defendant also claims that the wiretap application failed to show necessity. Dkt. # 198 at 16;  
11 Oral Argument. However, what fatally undermines both arguments is defendant’s  
12 misunderstanding of what constitutes a showing of necessity when the government is  
13 investigating a criminal conspiracy.

14 When a suspect is a member of a criminal conspiracy, and traditional methods of  
15 investigation will only succeed as to uncovering the crimes of this suspect and not those of his  
16 co-conspirators, necessity may still justify wiretapping that suspect’s phone in order to  
17 investigate the conspiracy to which he belongs. As the Ninth Circuit noted in United States v.  
18 McGuire, 307 F.3d 1192 (9th Cir. 2002):

19 [E]ven if some or many conspirators are imprisoned, others may remain at large,  
20 free to recruit others eager to break the law and to pursue the conspiracy’s illegal  
21 ends. Reflecting this concern, we have consistently upheld findings of necessity  
22 where traditional investigative techniques lead only to apprehension and  
prosecution of the main conspirators, but not to apprehension and prosecution of  
. . . other satellite conspirators.

23 Id. at 1197; see also United States v. Espudo, 2013 WL 655490, at \*1 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 21,  
24 2013) (“Even if [defendant] were correct and the wiretap was unnecessary to convict him  
25 individually of extortion, it would not render the wiretap unnecessary as to the many other  
26 named individuals and criminal activity.”). Even possessing sufficient evidence to indict  
27 members of a conspiracy does not in itself disprove the necessity of wiretapping their phones in

1 order to build a more effective case against them and their co-conspirators. McGuire, 307 F.3d  
2 at 1198; Espudo, 2013 WL 655490, at \*1. In short, the government need not establish that a  
3 wiretap is necessary to investigate the owner of a targeted phone if it has established that this  
4 wiretap is necessary to uncover the scope of a conspiracy. See United States v. Reed, 575 F.3d  
5 900, 911 (9th Cir. 2009) (adopting this rule as it applies to drug trafficking conspiracies) (“[T]he  
6 necessity requirement is directed to the objective of the investigation as a whole, and not to any  
7 particular person.”).

8 This Court finds that the omitted older evidence against defendant did not affect whether  
9 necessity existed to wiretap TT8, as this wiretap was directed at investigating the Salazar DTO,  
10 whereas the earlier evidence against defendant related to defendant’s role in entirely unrelated  
11 conspiracies. Defendant has not argued, and this Court does not believe, that any of the omitted  
12 evidence establishes that traditional investigative methods would have furthered the greater  
13 investigation of the Salazar DTO, or that the 91-page affidavit submitted in support of the  
14 government’s wiretap application did not persuasively establish the difficulty of investigating  
15 the Salazar DTO through traditional methods. Dkt. ## 218-4 at 35-38, 218-5, 218-6, 218-7,  
16 218-8 (Truong Aff.). Therefore, because the omitted information was not material to the  
17 determination of necessity, and because defendant has presented no other challenge to the  
18 necessity finding of the issuing judge, this Court concludes that Judge Jones (a) reviewed a full  
19 and complete statement from the government as to why a wiretap was necessary, and (b) did not  
20 abuse his discretion in ruling that necessity existed to wiretap TT8 in furtherance of the  
21 investigation of the Salazar DTO.

22 **B. The Government’s Immaterial Omissions Did Not Preclude Its Wiretap Application**  
23 **From Representing a Full and Complete Statement.**

24 At the hearing on this motion, defendant argued that the fruits of the TT8 wiretap should  
25 nevertheless be suppressed because, due to the government’s omissions, the government’s  
26 wiretap application still failed to include the “full and complete statement” contemplated by 18  
27 U.S.C. § 2518(1)(c). Specifically, defendant argued that the statute obliged the government to

1 disclose the additional evidence against him so that Judge Jones could evaluate the evidence for  
2 himself and rule accordingly, regardless of how this Court views its materiality.

3       However, the fact that the government's omissions were immaterial to the determination  
4 of necessity (as established by Ninth Circuit precedent) remains dispositive. The Ninth Circuit  
5 has never held that immaterial omissions could preclude a wiretap application from satisfying  
6 the "full and complete statement" requirement of 18 U.S.C. § 2518(1)(c); in fact, it has held the  
7 opposite. United States v. Fernandez, 388 F.3d 1199, 1236 (9th Cir. 2004), modified, 425 F.3d  
8 1248 (9th Cir. 2005) (finding that a wiretap application complied with the statute where the  
9 information omitted from the government's affidavits would not have affected the district court's  
10 determination of necessity had it been included); see also United States v. Rodriguez, 504 F.  
11 App'x 643, 644-45 (9th Cir. 2013), cert. denied, 133 S. Ct. 2403 (2013) (holding that a wiretap  
12 application provided a "full and complete statement" where the government's omissions were  
13 immaterial to the determination of necessity); United States v. Vasquez, 2010 WL 368792, at \*2,  
14 4 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 27, 2010) (rejecting defendants' argument that the government's omissions  
15 violated the "full and complete statement" requirement, noting that the government's omissions  
16 were immaterial to the determination of necessity).

17       Furthermore, to the extent that defendant suggests that these omissions rendered the  
18 wiretap application incomplete because Judge Jones was not on notice about the other evidence  
19 against defendant, it is worth noting that the application's supporting affidavit did mention that  
20 defendant had been identified as a drug trafficker in the previous investigations. Dkt. # 219 at 7.

21       Finally, defendant has not challenged the specificity or thoroughness of the government's  
22 91-page affidavit, or asserted any basis for not finding it "full and complete" other than the  
23 alleged omissions. See Fernandez, 388 F.3d at 1237 (noting how "generalized statements" and  
24 "boilerplate assertions" about why traditional investigative methods are insufficient in a given  
25 case raise doubts about the fullness or completeness of a wiretap application). Having reviewed  
26 the application, this Court finds no other grounds for challenging its statutory compliance.

1 **C. Defendant is Not Entitled to a Franks Hearing.**

2 Defendant is also not entitled to a Franks hearing. To obtain a Franks hearing based on  
3 flaws in the government's wiretap application, defendant must make a preliminary showing that  
4 the government made an intentional or reckless misstatement or omission in its application that  
5 was material to the issuing judge's finding of necessity. Shryock, 342 F.3d at 975-77. As this  
6 Court has already explained, including the omitted evidence against defendant in its wiretap  
7 application would not have affected whether Judge Jones found necessity to exist as to TT8.  
8 Therefore, a Franks hearing is not warranted.

9 **IV. CONCLUSION**

10 For all of the foregoing reasons, the Court DENIES defendant's motion to suppress.  
11 Dkt. # 198.

12  
13 DATED this 3rd day of October, 2014.

14  
15 

16 Robert S. Lasnik  
17 United States District Judge  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27